√·0

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/928,861	09/12/97	NEYMAN	I	P3251

LMC1/1026

```
DONALD R BOYS
P O BOX 187
AROMAS CA 95004
```

HOOSAIN, A   **EXAMINER**

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2748	

8

DATE MAILED: 10/26/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Aug 12, 1999_ .

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ___3___ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) _2-10 and 12-18_ is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) _2-10 and 12-18_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

  ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

    ☐ received.

    ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

    ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

FINAL DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 2-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Dekelbaum et al. (US Patent 5,838,682).

As to Claims 2,10,13, with respect to Figures 1A and 1B, **Dekelbaum et al.** teach a call

distribution method for routing Internet Protocol Network Telephony (IPNT) calls at Merchant

Sales Facility, 100, (customer premises) having a managing processor, 102, and a computer

workstation, 110, coupled to the managing processor, the managing processor having a set of

sessions (routing rules) specific to and accessible and editable by a sales representative (person)

assigned to the computer workstation, the call distribution method comprising steps of:

a) receiving an incoming IPNT call at the managing processor (Col. 12, lines 1-8);

b) determining the sales representative (person) assigned to the workstation is an intended

recipient for the call (Col. 14, lines 40-48);

c) requesting routing by the managing processor from the specific set of current session routing

rules accessible and editable by the sales representative (person) assigned to the computer

workstation (Col. 14, lines 19-33); and

d) routing the call according to the current session routing rules specific to the appropriate sales

representative (person) (Col. 14, lines 19-48 and Col. 14, line 49 through Col. 15, line 25).

As to Claims 3,17, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the call

distribution method of Claim 2 wherein the editable session routing rules specific to the sales

representative (person) are maintained at the computer workstation (Col. 14, lines 19-33).

As to Claims 4,14,18, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the

call distribution method of Claim 2 wherein the editable session routing rules for the intended

recipient are maintained on an ACD 106 (central client-server router executed on a processor)

(Col. 14, lines 40-48).

As to Claims 5,15, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the call

distribution method of Claim 4 wherein the processor is the managing processor for the call center

(Col. 11, lines 52-67).

As to Claims 6,12,16, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the

call distribution method of Claim 4 wherein the processor executing the client-server router is a

processor separate from the managing processor (Col. 11, lines 45-67).

As to Claim 7, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the call

distribution method of Claim 2 comprising a step executed by the sales representative (person) for

editing the session routing rules via an interactive Graphical User Interface (GUI)) executing on

the intended recipient's computer workstation (Figures 6-9).

As to Claim 8, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teaches the call

distribution method of Claim 4 wherein there are multiple workstations coupled to the managing

processor, and the ACD (client-server router) has session router-rule portions dedicated to

individual ones of sales representatives at individual ones of the computer workstations, and

wherein an individual sales representative, through a browser (user interface) executing on a

computer workstation, may access the session portion dedicated to that sales representative, and

process (edit) the session routing rules therein (Col. 12, lines 1-37).

As to claim 9, in addition to the information above, **Dekelbaum et al.** further teach the call

distribution method of claim 8 wherein the browser (user interface) comprises a graphical user

interface (GUI) having web pages (icons) indicating session IDs (telephone calls received) and for

viewing session history (choices of disposition of telephone calls received), and including steps for

a sales representative to precipitate actions in call routing by web page operations (iconic drag-

and-drop procedures) (Col. 14, lines 19-33 and Col. 15, lines 25-43)

3. Claims 2-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Bateman**

et al. (US Patent 5,884,032).

As to Claims 2,10,13, with respect to Figure 1, **Bateman et al.** teach a call back method for

routing Internet Protocol Network Telephony (IPNT) calls at customer premises, 2, having a call

center server, 28, (managing processor) and a computer workstation, 11, coupled to the call

center server (managing processor), the call center server (managing processor) having a set of

call back routing rules specific to and accessible and editable by an agent (person) assigned to the

computer workstation, the call back method comprising steps of:

a) receiving an incoming IPNT call at the call center server (managing processor) (Col. 6, lines 1-

6);

b) determining the agent (person) assigned to the workstation is an intended recipient for the call

(Col. 6, lines 31-45);

c) requesting routing by the call center server (managing processor) from the specific set of

current call back routing rules accessible and editable by the agent (person) assigned to the

computer workstation (Col. 6, lines 45-55); and

d) routing the call according to the current call back routing rules specific to the agent (person) (Col. 6, lines 41-50 and Col. 7, lines 43-60).

As to Claims 3,17, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back method of Claim 2 wherein the editable routing rules specific to the agent (person) are maintained at the computer workstation (Col. 6, lines 45-52 and Col. 7, lines 43-50).

As to Claims 4,14,18, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back method of Claim 2 wherein the call back editable routing rules for the intended recipient are maintained on a central client-server router, 46, executed on a processor (Col. 6, lines 31-41).

As to Claims 5,15, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back method of Claim 4 wherein the processor is the managing processor for the call center (Col. 6, lines 25-32).

As to Claims 6,12,16, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 4 wherein the processor executing the client-server router is a processor connected to the LAN separate from the managing processor (Col. 5, lines 23-34).

As to Claim 7, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back

method of Claim 2 comprising a step executed by the person for editing the call back routing rules

via a WEB Page interactive Graphical User Interface (GUI) executing on the intended recipient's

computer workstation (Col. 6, lines 48-52).

As to Claim 8, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back

method of Claim 4 wherein there are multiple workstations coupled to the managing processor,

and the client-server router has call back router-rule portions dedicated to individual ones of

agents at individual ones of the computer workstations, and wherein an individual agent, through

a WEB page user interface executing on a computer workstation to which the agent is assigned,

may access the call back portion dedicated to that agent, and update (edit) the call back routing

rules therein (Col. 4, lines 51-67 and Col. 6, lines 55-60 and Col. 7, lines 43-50).

As to claim 9, in addition to the information above, **Bateman et al.** further teach the call back

method of claim 8 wherein the browser (user interface) comprises a graphical user interface (GUI)

having web pages (icons) indicating hotlist (telephone calls received) and for scheduling (choices

of disposition) of hotlist telephone calls received, and including steps for an agent to precipitate

actions in call routing by web page operations (iconic drag-and-drop procedures) (Col. 6, lines

48-60 and 8-13 and Col. 8, line 62 through Col. 9, line 18)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-18 have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Dunn et al.. (US Patent 5,838,682) teach a method for allowing customers to modifiy services

using the Internet.

Klingman (US Patent 5,729,594) teaches a method for making purchases over the Internet.

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

7.   **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

        Box AF

                Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

                Washington, D.C. 20231

        or faxed to:

                (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED

                PROCEDURE")

        Or:

                (703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label

                "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

        Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA.,

        Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to **Allan Hoosain** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4012. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Krista Zele, can be reached on (703) 305-4701.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Allan Hoosain   ΑΗ

Patent Examiner

October 18, 1999

FAN S. TSANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER